

1 Ford Greene  
2 California State Bar No. 107601  
3 HUB LAW OFFICES  
4 711 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard  
5 San Anselmo, California 94960-1949  
6 Telephone: (415) 258-0360  
7 Telecopier: (415) 456-5318

FILED  
MAY 31 1994  
HOWARD HANSON  
MARIN COUNTY CLERK  
BY C HARDING DEPUTY

5 Attorney for Defendant and Cross-Complainant  
6 GERALD ARMSTRONG

8 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
9 FOR THE COUNTY OF MARIN

RECEIVED  
MAY 31 1994

10 CHURCH OF SCIENTOLOGY INTERNATIONAL, )  
11 a California not-for-profit )  
12 religious corporation, )  
13 Plaintiff, )  
14 vs. )  
15 GERALD ARMSTRONG; MICHAEL WALTON; )  
16 THE GERALD ARMSTRONG CORPORATION, )  
17 a California for-profit )  
18 corporation; DOES 1 through 100, )  
19 inclusive, )  
20 Defendants. )

No. 157 680 HUB LAW OFFICES  
*To Benz 5-31-94 Ha*  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO COMPEL FURTHER  
RESPONSES TO FORM  
INTERROGATORIES FROM  
PLAINTIFF  
Date: 6/20/94  
Time: 2:30 p.m.  
Dept: Referee Benz  
Trial Date: 9/29/94

20 I. INTRODUCTION

21 Code of Civil Procedure section 2030 (1) states in part "If  
22 the propounding party, on receipt of a response to  
23 interrogatories, deems that (1) an answer to a particular  
24 interrogatory is evasive or incomplete, or . . . (3) an objection  
25 to an interrogatory is without merit or too general, that party  
26 may move for an order compelling a further response." For the  
27 purposes of the instant motion, Scientology, rather than directly  
28 responding to the interrogatories at issue, interposed a number of



1 boilerplate objections.

2 As will be discussed below, the objections are without merit  
3 as well as too general.

4 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

5 Armstrong adopts by reference his statement of facts as well  
6 as his Statement of Requests for Admission and Responses in  
7 Dispute filed in conjunction with this motion as though they were  
8 fully set forth. In addition, Armstrong adopts the various  
9 factual statements made in his Statement of Form Interrogatories  
10 and Disputed Responses filed in connection with this motion.

11 **III. SCIENTOLOGY HAS FAILED TO SUFFICIENTLY RESPOND**  
12 **TO CERTAIN INTERROGATORIES REGARDING DAMAGES**

13 **A. Form Interrogatories 6.1 through 6.7**

14 Form interrogatories 6.1 through 6.7 requested plaintiff to  
15 identify any physical, mental or emotional injuries relating to  
16 the incident. Scientology stated that "CSI objects that this form  
17 interrogatory is inapplicable to a corporation, and vague and  
18 unintelligible as phrased."

19 Since members of the Scientology religion can suffer such  
20 injuries, Armstrong is entitled to know whether such persons have  
21 suffered harm in consequence of his alleged actions.

22 **B. Form Interrogatories 7.1 through 7.3**

23 This set of interrogatories pertains to damages to property  
24 claimed by Scientology.

25 Here, too, Scientology stated that "CSI objects that this  
26 form interrogatory is inapplicable to a corporation, and vague and  
27 unintelligible as phrased."

28 Armstrong is entitled to know whether such damages have



1 resulted harm in consequence of his alleged actions.

2 **C. Form Interrogatory 8.1**

3 Interrogatory 8.1 asks whether Scientology has lost any  
4 income or earning capacity.

5 Here, too, Scientology stated that "CSI objects that this  
6 form interrogatory is inapplicable to a corporation, and vague and  
7 unintelligible as phrased."

8 Armstrong is entitled to know whether such damages have  
9 resulted in harm in consequence of his alleged actions.

10 **D. Form Interrogatory 9.1**

11 This interrogatory asks whether there are any other damages  
12 that Scientology attributes to Armstrong's activities. Plaintiff  
13 responded:

14 Objection. CSI objects that this form interrogatory is  
15 inapplicable to this action, and vague and  
16 unintelligible as phrased. To the extent that the  
17 "INCIDENT" this interrogatory is referring to is  
18 Armstrong's fraudulent conveyance of his assets to  
19 others in or about 1990, CSI sustained damage in the  
20 amount of those conveyances, together with any  
21 appreciation or increase in value which those assets  
22 have acquired since their initial conveyance.

23 Scientology is evasive in trying to limit the interrogatory to  
24 Armstrong's alleged fraudulent conveyances. In is clear that  
25 incident means every incident or every time CSI was damaged in  
26 some way by Gerald Armstrong.

27 **E. Form Interrogatories 9.2, 10.2, 10.3**

28 Interrogatory 9.2 asks for the identification of documents  
that support Scientology's damages. Its response that such  
documents are the depositions of defendants, documents produced in  
this action and unidentified Marin County public records is  
inadequate. If there is any documentation of Scientology's



1 damages, it should be identified. If there are no such documents,  
2 that should be stated.

3 Interrogatory 10.2 asks for physical, mental or emotional  
4 disabilities that plaintiff had immediately before Armstrong's  
5 activities commenced. Here, too, Scientology stated that "CSI  
6 objects that this form interrogatory is inapplicable to a  
7 corporation, and vague and unintelligible as phrased." If  
8 Scientology is making no such claim on behalf of any of its  
9 members, or otherwise, it should so state.

10 Interrogatory 10.3 asks for an enumeration of injuries for  
11 which Scientology is now claiming damages. Here, too, Scientology  
12 stated that "CSI objects that this form interrogatory is  
13 inapplicable to a corporation, and vague and unintelligible as  
14 phrased." If Scientology is making no such claim on behalf of any  
15 of its members, or otherwise, it should so state.

16 **F. Form Interrogatories 12.1 - 12.7**

17 These interrogatories have to do with specifying the  
18 identities of persons or other sources of evidence as to the  
19 incident, which are what Scientology claims to have been  
20 Armstrong's breaches of the settlement contract. Scientology  
21 evades responding truthfully by attempting to narrowly construe  
22 the "incident." Plaintiff also attempts to invoke the attorney  
23 client and attorney work product privileges. This is improper  
24 because Armstrong is entitled to receive the information  
25 requested, particularly because such information has nothing to do  
26 with the substance of privileged matters.

27 **G. Form Interrogatories 13.1 - 13.2**

28 These interrogatories request information which pertains to



1 surveillance and reports thereof. Scientology's response is  
2 evasive because it attempts to limit the meaning of the "incident"  
3 to the alleged fraudulent conveyances to the exclusion of what it  
4 has claimed to have been Armstrong's breaches of the settlement  
5 contract.

6 H. Form Interrogatory 14.1

7 This question asks whether or not plaintiff contends that  
8 defendants violated any statute and that such was the proximate  
9 cause of the incident. Scientology's response, again, is evasive  
10 because it attempts to limit the meaning of the "incident" to the  
11 alleged fraudulent conveyances to the exclusion of what it has  
12 claimed to have been Armstrong's breaches of the settlement  
13 contract.

14 IV. SCIENTOLOGY HAS FAILED TO RESPOND TO  
15 INTERROGATORIES LINKED TO REQUESTS FOR ADMISSIONS

16 In conjunction with the Form Interrogatories, Armstrong  
17 propounded 35 Requests for Admission. Interrogatory 17.1 requires  
18 that Scientology state certain vital information for each response  
19 to a Request for Admission that is not an "unqualified admission."  
20 Since Scientology did not respond with any such unqualified  
21 admission, it must respond to Form Interrogatory 17.1.

22 Rather than deal with all these matters here, Armstrong  
23 respectfully directs the attention of the Referee to his Separate  
24 Statement of Form Interrogatories and Responses in Dispute.

25 V. MONETARY SANCTIONS SHOULD BE IMPOSED

26 Code of Civil Procedure section 2030 (1) states that the  
27 Court shall impose a monetary sanction under Code of Civil  
28 procedure section 2023 against any party and attorney who opposes



1 a motion to compel a further response unless it finds that the one  
2 subject to the sanction acted with substantial justification or  
3 that other circumstances make its imposition unjust.

4 Based upon the foregoing discussion, it is clear that the  
5 only possibly valid objection was that which was based upon  
6 relevance. As to each of the relevance objections, however, they  
7 were interposed with no justification inasmuch as each request and  
8 interrogatory dealt directly with the issues framed by the  
9 complaint and answer in this litigation.

10 VI. CONCLUSION

11 Based upon the foregoing arguments, defendant Gerald  
12 Armstrong respectfully submits that the motion to compel further  
13 responses should be granted and monetary sanctions imposed.

14 DATED: May 31, 1994

HUB LAW OFFICES

15  
16  
17 By: 

FORD GREENE  
Attorney for Defendant and  
Cross-Complainant  
GERALD ARMSTRONG

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28